DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 324 282 SP 032 592

AUTHOR Carter, Marcia J.; And Others
TITLE Professionalization: Whose Responsibility?
PUB DATE 29 Mar 90
NOTE 26p.; Four papers presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (New Orleans, LA, March 28-31, 1990). Title varies slightly on three of four papers.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Collected Works - Conference Proceedings (021)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Accreditation (Institutions); *Allied Health Occupations Education; *Certification; Codes of Ethics; Cooperative Planning; *Credentials; Higher Education; Institutional Mission; *Professional Associations; *Professional Education

ABSTRACT

One requisite of a profession is that its practitioners hold a credential certifying that the individual is competent to provide needed services. In the fields of health, physical education, recreation, and dance, diverse groups compete in credentialing practitioners. The four papers in this collection discuss who is, or should be, responsible for professionalization in these fields. The first paper, "Professionalization: Everbody's Right But Whose Responsibility?" (Marcia J. Carter), reflects on the various groups which assume responsibility in credentialing activities and why their activities have become intertwined. The second paper, "Professionalization: Whose Responsibility?" (G. Ann Uhler), emphasizes the role of professional preparation institutions and the impositions placed on higher education by other groups. The third paper, "Professionalization: Whose Responsibility? Professional Societies?" (William B. Cissell), stresses the increasing vested interest of professional societies in credentialing. The fourth paper, "Professionalization: Whose Responsibility? Our Future Agenda: Crosstalk" (Florence Grebner), takes the position that it is no longer feasible for any one group to create a profession or to represent a profession suggesting, rather, that a collegium be formed enabling interdependent responsibility. (JD)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED324282

PROFESSIONALIZATION: WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

Marcia J. Carter
University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls

G. Ann Uhlir
Texas Woman's University, Denton

William B. Cissell
Texas Woman's University, Denton

Florence Grebner
Illinois Benedictine College, Lisle

March 29, 1990

The reform movement in education has spurred renewed interests toward professionalization by self-proclaimed emerging professions. The fields of health, physical education, recreation, and dance have capitalized on this movement in an attempt to move away from the status of occupation toward the status of profession. The extent to which each field of study is successful in achieving professional status is a function of its willingness to follow a prescribed developmental sequence, namely:

Identify job tasks or service areas,
Establish professional and public recognition,
Identify educational competencies and formalize training
Gain political legitimation
Develop a credential and credentialing procedures, and
Adopt and enforce ethical codes.

One requisite of a profession is that its practitioners hold a credential, which validates to the consumer and to the employer that the individual is competent to provide needed services. Who is responsible for developing credentials and for rendering an individual competent to practice as professionals?

SP 032 592

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
M. J. Carter, G. Ann Uhlir
W. B. Cissell, F. Grebner
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

The surge of interest in professionalizing the fields of health, physical education, recreation, and dance has been accompanied by competing activities of many diverse groups. Among these groups are professional organizations, professional preparation institutions, service-oriented organizations, employers, the government, and even the judicial system.

Professionalization has become everybody's right. But whose responsibility, is it? Addressing this question are three papers. These papers were presented at the annual convention of the American Alliance for Health, Physical Education, Recreation and Dance (AAHPERD), New Orleans, March 29, 1990.

The first paper (Carter) reflects on the various groups which assume a responsibility in credentialing activities and why their activities have become intertwined. The second paper (Uhlir) emphasizes the role of professional preparation institutions and the impositions placed on higher education by other groups. The third paper (Cissell) stresses the increasing vested interest of professional societies. The fourth paper (Grebner) takes the position that it is no longer feasible for any one group to create a profession or to represent a profession. Rather, it is suggested that a colleqium be formed, enabling interdependent responsibility. One additional paper, the role of the courts in the professionalization process, is not included in this document. It is available on audio cassette tape from AAHPERD, under the title, "Professionalization: Whose Responsibility."

PROFESSIONALIZATION: EVERYBODY'S RIGHT BUT WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

Marcia J. Carter

Good morning and welcome to a session coordinated by the credentialing taskforce of AAHPERD. We have gathered individuals with expertise in several areas inherent in the development and implementation of credentialing programs. Each presenter will focus on one particular audience who either is influenced by or effects the credentialing processes evident within the Alliance.

A credential identifies persons, programs, or agencies who have earned the right to offer services in the areas of movement, health, and leisure to consumers. A credential results from successful mastery of criteria established by either professional organizations, professional preparation programs, credentialing bodies and experts, or government. A credential validates some combination of practice, education, and examination and is evidence to the employer and consumer that a practicing professional is competent to offer services.

Credentials are symbols representing the maturity level of professions. As a profession evolves, each of the audiences shares in its development and in establishing the rights or privileges assumed with the wearing of a credential. As professionalization brings sophistication to credentialing standards, responsibilities among the various audiences become intertwined. This mixing of responsibility is attributed to four causes:

1. **NATURE OF THE CREDENTIALING PROCESSES.** Accreditation, licensure, certification, and registration, the four central processes, usually require varying amounts of education, training, and evaluation

to meet respective standards. Upon which of these three indices should lie the burden of proof, the setting where the competence is acquired, or used, or identified?

2. **USE OF CREDENTIALS.** As specialties have developed, varying interpretations have been given to each form of credentialing. For instance, in one profession an applicant must be registered prior to sitting for an examination while in another, one is only permitted to register after successful completion of an examination.

3. **CONTROL OF CREDENTIALS.** Historically the professions established and monitored their respective credentialing programs. Since the 1970's the government and courts through enforcement of, for instance, the uniform guidelines for employee selection and state sunset legislation have acted as credentialing agents. Additionally professional experts are now called upon to develop and defend evaluation tools.

4. **CREDENTIALING ALTERNATIVES.** One consequence of professionalization is the growth of the body of knowledge defining a profession. This results in an expectation on entry level personnel or already existing programs to demonstrate higher levels of competence and or specialization. The outcome is the need to assure new and or updated competence levels with more rigorous credentialing alternatives uncomfortable to those previously in the system.

The mingling of responsibility results when the audiences become involved in the development, management, and implementation of credentialing standards. In addition to the primary audience, the consumer, seven distinct audiences are involved in existing AAHPERD

credentialing programs:

1. **PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

   Provide for CEU's required by credentialing programs,

   Be an advocate for practicing professionals at state and federal levels,

   Endorse professional preparation standards, and

   Establish ethics codes.

2. **PROFESSIONAL PREPARATION PROGRAMS**

   Develop practicing professionals,

   Define and deliver knowledge base and educational criteria validated by credentials, and

   Recognize standards of professional organizations, credentialing bodies and experts, and employers.

3. **EMPLOYERS**

   Establish role delineation and definition of job tasks,

   Hire credentialed professionals, and

   Support ethical practices,

4. **GOVERNMENT AND JUDICIAL SYSTEMS**

   Control licensure, and

   Define equal employment opportunities and antitrust laws.

5. **CREDENTIALING EXPERTS**

   Develop valid and reliable evaluation tools/techniques, and provide research base to validate KSA's of a profession,

6. **CREDENTIALING BODIES**

   Define eligibility, entry, and CEU requirements of practice,

   Enforce ethics codes, and

   Collect fees for credential issuance.

7. PRACTICING PROFESSIONALS

Comply with standards set by professional organizations, professional preparation, institutions, employers, government and the courts, credentialing experts and bodies, and meets consumer expectations as competent professional,

Sit on credentialing and professional boards, belong to professional organizations, and generate job tasks and roles.

Varying levels of credentialing responsibility are apparent within the Alliance. The continuum extends from no or minimal involvement as within the area of aquatics to standards set for university recreation curricula. Recent socioeconomic and political conditions have led to professionalization barriers resulting in the abdication of responsibility to develop, manage, and implement credentialing standards within professional organizations. Panel members will present specific illustrations and issues representative of their audience perspective.

PROFESSIONALIZATION: WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

Professional Preparation Institutions?

G. Ann Uhlir

For nearly a century, colleges and universities have submitted themselves to the rigors of external review by accreditation associations. Beginning with the North Central Association of Colleges and Secondary Schools in 1913, institutions of higher education have voluntarily joined organizations to demonstrate that institutional quality was commensurate with the standards for membership in the association. Initially membership meant that your college or university would be published on a list of members. Eventually, membership reflected that members had met minimum criteria designed to protect the public from persons who represented themselves as qualified but had substandard education. The idea was that the public would know that minimal standards required for membership were met, and that the graduates could be expected to perform at or above these standards.

The concept of institutional accreditation over the years has grown to represent a process whereby colleges and universities engage in periodic self-evaluation for the purpose of stimulating continuing growth and improvement. Although institutional accreditation does not review individual programs in depth, the accreditation does demonstrate that the institution as a whole is fulfilling its mission and purpose. Concern for all aspects of the university becomes evident in the review process. Academic policies, faculty, student life, and financial support are evaluated.

Specialized accreditation, on the other hand, beginning with the

American Medical Association in 1906, establishes standards for the practitioner of the profession, and attempts to examine in detail the education program, curricula, faculty, library resources, and learning environment that prepares the entry level professional. The object is to protect the public by insuring that graduates of the program have the knowledges and abilities essential for the practice of the profession. Today there are over 70 specialized fields which have accreditation programs, and the number is growing. The process has become so complex there are accrediting associations to accredit the professional accreditation associations. The Council on Post-Secondary Accreditation (COPA) has become the agency that regulates the regulators by establishing certain standards these agencies must meet.

In addition to the institutional and specialized accreditation associations, public institutions are subjected to state regulations that establish degree authority, approve programs and scope of the institution, and in Texas, literally approve each and every course. The interests of the state are both educational and economic. The duplication of programs or the absence of needed programs impede the development of the state and its citizens.

What is the College or University's role in this process of professional preparation? How do we divide up the turf? How do we know where properly the authority of one ends and the next begins?

Clearly, the College or University must have authority over its programs and degrees and must make the ultimate decisions regarding which programs it will offer, within its authority. The alternative,

of establishing dozens of programs across the state or country, all clones of one model set by an accreditation agency, would lead us down the road to standardization. John Dewey, in his book, Schools of Tomorrow, written in 1903 warned of standardization. When there is only one way to do things, when there is a prescribed sequence for learning, when we have the ultimate solution for how education is to progress, we have ended experimentation. Most of us, I think, can agree, that diversity is one of the greatest strengths that exists within American education. Creativity thrives in environments that allow mistakes to be made. Preparing professionals must be more than an assembly line of so many in, so many out.

Accreditation has become so specialized for some programs, there has been little opportunity for the innovative to infuse new life into time-tested, proven protocols for education. Some say, why fix it if it works? Dealing with change is often difficult, and especially when it seems apparent that the status quo is okay. As the Executive Director of our Houston Center said to me the other day, the physical therapy students know where they are going to be a year from next Thursday at 3:00 p.m.

For the pragmatists among us, most of us, no doubt, let me illustrate why it is important to fix things that work. Recently we reviewed all the programs within the College of Health Sciences to determine their status with respect to specialized accreditations. Some are accredited, some wish to seek accreditation, and at least one has decided to ignore the accreditation option at the moment. In reviewing the materials submitted, I noted that many accrediting

agencies limit the given number of students that may be enrolled in a particular course or practicum setting. In some cases, the upper limit is identical to the absolute minimum the state of Texas allows to hold a class. The issue on one hand is quality control; on the other, financial prudence. It occurs to me, that given the variety of teaching methods available today, there might be a way to provide quality or perhaps superior instruction for students that would exceed the prescribed faculty to student ratio. In my view, we must be more productive in the delivery of instruction because the supply of faculty is on the decline at the very same time, the demand for more graduates in most of our professions is on the rise. Allan Ostar, President of the American Association of State Schools and Colleges, estimates that the faculty shortage will reach 500,000 by the year 2000. Most of the new faculty will come from the ranks of women and minorities, by the way, the only source of underutilized people. Obviously, push has come to shove.

One of the greatest concerns I have regarding the encroachment of accreditation requirements on higher education is that for all practical purposes, the student is forced into a track that allows her or him no choice. Program requirements for meeting specialized accreditation standards are on the increase. Some fields, like physical therapy, have now established the Masters Degree as the entry level degree. Other disciplines are proposing a five year baccalaureate degree. Recently we prepared a program of studies for undergraduate students in exercise science whose ultimate goal is a physical therapy credential. In order to meet

the prerequisites for entry into the Masters Degree program, the student would have no electives in the bachelor's degree, and few if any choices about the sciences, social sciences, etc., required for general education.

What ever happened to liberal education? What about all the reports of this past decade that have urged that we educate our young people as well as prepare them for work? Students are often blamed for their lack of interest in the humanities, in sciences, and the arts but can we hold them totally responsible when we allow no room in a four year curriculum to explore and pursue subjects beyond the requirements? Must the entire curriculum be devoted to the ultimate goal of work?

Which brings me to the question "Why are we so focused on preparing people for work?" The predictions from Nalsbitt and Aberdine's Megatrends 2000, is that each person, on average, graduating in the next decade will change professions three times, and jobs, ten times. What does this say to those of us in higher education? I think it says we must provide our graduates with the will and skill to go on learning. What is the point in devoting four or five years to the exclusive study and practice of a set of skills that may disappear in a few years, to the exclusion of developing the capacities required for adaptation to the changes sure to come.

It occurs to me that our professional zeal to learn more and more about less and less, to focus our specialization within our specialization and then set up accreditations to approve these sub

sets, is going nowhere. It is a time of linkages, of coming back to the center, of collaborating with other disciplines, of disciplinary education. If nothing else, we have learned that the major problems facing society can only be resolved by the sharing of perspectives from a variety of academic disciplines. AIDs is a case in point. While we are researching the cause, we are looking for a vaccine, searching for methods of educating people to prevent the further spread of the disease, seeking methods of treatment for the ill, providing psychological support for the families, the homophobic, and the uninformed, and attempting to resolve the cost in lost resources, both people and money to our society. Which accreditation organization shall we turn to to certify that people needed for this comprehensive set of interrelated problems are adequately prepared?

The professional preparation institution has the primary role in planning the course of study for such people. It is within academe that biologists, health educators, allied health professionals, psychologists, and others required to deal with such questions as the one just proposed, can work together. Each plays a part in the plan that can ultimately lead us out of this morass.

Granted, the professional preparation institution has the obligation for providing the essential skills and knowledges for the entry level practitioner. And the value of the specialized accreditation association in identifying those skills and knowledges, as well as providing a means for determining that the graduates do, in fact, meet these standards is recognized. Usually, the accrediting agency is a part of a professional association which develops the requirements

for accreditation and relates them to current practice in the professional field. And the benefit of the specialized accreditation agency in stimulating improvement of programs through this process is considerable.

From the institution's point of view, participation in the accreditation process may not be a matter of choice. Accreditation may be a necessary condition for graduates. Accreditation may be required to establish eligibility for public and or private funds and grants. Accreditation may be necessary for the evaluation and improvement of program quality or to attract students. And it may be highly important for program prestige.

Although specialized accreditation may infringe upon the absolute autonomy of institutions to develop and conduct programs as they wish, accreditation can serve to complement the creative work of visionary faculty. Encouraging the institution to achieve the goal of quality assurance without mandating conformity should prove beneficial to the public, that interested community the accrediting agency exists to protect.

What happens when criteria are set that our schools cannot meet? Exacting standards that are too demanding in terms of personnel required, the amount of money that needs to be given for the program to operate, and the cost of the accreditation process itself often leaves the institution with only the alternative to disband the program. How can that be in the interest of the public served, when there are not enough professionals to meet society's needs? The best way to destroy a profession is to set the standards

for entry and the rules for preparation beyond what is feasible. The void is soon filled by an emerging discipline, or the need met by an existing profession.

In all of this, the College or University preparing future professionals ultimately must stake a claim. Higher education has the scholars, the future professionals, and the laboratories where professionals learn. Rather than be squeezed by the external forces of agencies and law, colleges and universities need to affirm that they will educate the student for life in the4 21st Century, will prepare the student to go on learning, and will provide her or him with the entry level skills for beginning the practice of a profession. Higher education must work in partnership with external accreditation associations and governing legislative bodies to achieve these mutual goals.

PROFESSIONALIZATION: WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?
Professional Societies?

William B. Cissell

Introduction

Professional societies are organizations of persons with specialized skills and competencies, who meet together and share information about ways to maintain and enhance these skills and competencies and to assure the consuming public of an acceptable quality in the practice by their members. Professional societies commonly focus their attention on three basic areas of concern related to assuring the public of quality of practice. These include a) preparation of aspiring professionals to have specified entry-level skills and competencies, b) guiding credentialed practitioners in continued professional development to assure maintenance and enhancement of the essential skills and competencies of the profession, and c) preventing practice by those who have never demonstrated the essential skills and competencies of the profession or who have failed to practice with an acceptable level of competence. This particular presentation is focused on the first concern--assuring that the preparation of the aspiring new professional develops the skills and competencies essential to practice. It will review the ways in which professional societies strive to influence the quality of professional preparation programs, particularly through accreditation.

Accreditation in Higher Education

Accreditation is, theoretically, an organized, systematic program for recognizing professional preparation programs and the institutions

with which they are affiliated for achieving and maintaining a level of performance, integrity, and quality worthy of recognition. In contrast to most other countries, it is primarily through nongovernmental, voluntary professional associations or service oriented institutions that professional preparation standards are established and recognized in the United States. These groups use a system of voluntary, non-governmental evaluation commonly, but not always, called accreditation to determine the eligibility for recognition and to inspire programs and their parent institutions to maintain and enhance the quality of the preparation being provided.

The most common pattern for implementing the accreditation process includes seven steps. These are a) application to the accrediting body for authorization to initiate the accreditation process (pay initial fees and solicit guidance from accrediting agency), b) performance of a self-study to highlight the strengths and weaknesses recognized internally (a guide is provided by the accrediting body as a standard against which the subject program can be compared), c) hosting a site visit by a team of outside evaluators (experts in the discipline or combination of disciplines being evaluated), d) receipt and review of the report of the site visit team (the subject program and/or institution checks the accuracy of the knowledge and perceptions of the site visitors and reviews the guidance for improvement being offered), e) submission of a response to the report of the site visitors (indicating adjustments proposed for eliminating or improving upon the deficiencies noted), f) reception of the decision of the accrediting body to award recognition or to

withhold it, and g) implementation of changes recommended by the accrediting body for improvement of the quality of the program in question. The decision to withhold or postpone awarding accreditation can be appealed.

The process described above may seem fairly simple and uncomplicated. In actual practice it is often more complex than this sounds. In fact, the accrediting process is evolving and may well deviate from the common pattern. The variations in expenses related to the process are often troubling. These may vary from several thousands of dollars for single program evaluations to hundreds of thousands of dollars in fees, travel expenses, personnel time, and resources expended to complete an institutional self-study, site visit, and credentialing maintenance process. Therefore, the benefits to the institution, to the present and/or future students, and to society must be perceived as substantial to warrant the expense.

Who Accredits Programs of Higher Education?

Programs of higher education and the higher education institutions as a whole are accredited by basically two types of accrediting bodies--those which provide specialized accreditation of professional schools and degree awarding or diploma granting programs and those which accredit the institutions as a whole. There are nine regional commissions in six geographic areas of our country, which grant total institutional accreditation, (e.g., the Commission of Higher Education, Middle Association of Schools and Colleges; the Commission on Institutions of Higher Education, New England Association of Schools and Colleges; and the Commission on Vocational, Technical, and

Career Institutions).

In 1975, the Council on Postsecondary Accreditation recognized five specialized associations that accredit total institutions on a national scale. According to a 1987 publication of the American Council on Education, titled American Universities and Colleges (13th ed.), there are thirty-nine national associations which offer recognized specialty and/or professional accreditation for programs or other academic units within an institution. If that is correct, there are a multitude of associations and agencies that are offering less than recognized specialty and/or professional accreditation. These can be labelled quasi-accreditation programs.

What is Happening in the Alliance?

Seaman (1990) has developed a matrix of the credentialing activities pertinent to the disciplines represented by the associations in AAHPERD. These cover a broad range of processes and programs, which include licensure, registration, and certification for the individual professional and accreditation and program approval (quasi-accreditation) for professional preparation programs in higher education. This matrix reflects the broad range of institutions and agencies serving as credentialing bodies, including state governments, professional societies, and independent, nonprofit specialty credentialing agencies. The ones providing accreditation for professional preparation programs in health education, for example, include the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education and the Council on Education in Public Health. The Association for the

Advancement of Health Eduction (AAHE) and the Society for Public Health Education (SOPHE) jointly provide approval for baccalaureate programs of health eduction, which is a quasi-accreditation process.

Several of the associations within AAHPERD and many of the related professional societies are concerned about the practices of the agencies that credential their members. They continually monitor the practices of these agencies, share resources and affiliate with them when it is appropriate to do so, and offer recommendations and criticism when these seem desirable or necessary.

Summary

Professional societies represent only one of several entities accepting the responsibility to assure the public that persons practicing or performing research are competent. Credentialing agencies, institutions of higher education, governments (state and national), and consumers and consumer advocacy groups share in this responsibility. Professional societies have a strong vested interest in developing confidence among consumers in the competence of their members. Associations in the Alliance are becoming increasingly aware of the roles in which they serve for meeting credentialing responsibility of professional societies, and they are taking actions to serve in these roles ever more effectively.

PROFESSIONALIZATION: WHOSE RESPONSIBILITY?

Our Future Agenda: Crosstalk

Florence Grebner

The debate over who is responsible for the control of professional practice may well have turned the corner toward a new debate - that of how to proceed with shared responsibility united in purpose. The central issue here, is the extent to which each stakeholder, while preserving its distinctive autonomy, is willing to be part of a collegium, formed around a common purpose.

What is our common purpose? The common purpose focuses on the reason that a profession exists in the first place -- the benefit of the consumer. Naisbitt and Aburdene, in their book, Megatrends 2000, address the primacy of the consumer. Say they, we have moved away from the primacy of the organization, to the notion that all organization, to the notion exist for the benefit of society, in the long run; and for the benefit of the consumer, in the short run. The needs of the consumer, then, is the true common purpose for the profession.

Unlike the historical practice in which a single group professionalized its field of study in order to meet the needs of the consumer; today, it is not feasible for one stakeholder to represent a profession or to create a profession. Many diverse groups have already claimed a right to meet the needs of consumers. In some cases their efforts are distinct from the efforts of other groups; and in other cases their efforts are overlapping and even at cross purposes with other groups.

Professions of the future will result when each stakeholder carries out its own responsibilities, but in relation to those carried out by each other stakeholder. This collaborative effort calls for a collegium -- a community, which fosters interdependence of the various stakeholders, and at the same time supports the fulfillment of the distinctive right and responsibilities by each. No one gives up authority; rather each gains extended authority by virtue of the whole being greater than the sum of its parts.

In a collegium, hierarchal authority and competition for autonomy are replaced by networking. This is not a new notion. The close of the 80's saw the shift from hierarchies to networks, accompanied by the collaborative approach to decision-making. It is not a matter of coming together and defining the whole and then dividing it up in equal responsibilities; it is a matter of determining the distinctive contribution of each stakeholder and also determining the collective contributions of the larger professional community. This form of networking requires two levels of decision-making: autonomous decision-making by each stakeholder, relative to all other groups; and shared decision-making among the collective stakeholders, relative to the transcending purposes. Each of these thrives on crosstalk among the stakeholders. Shared decision-making diminishes single-interest advocacy, in favor of advocating for the larger whole. This approach to decision-making goes beyond the concepts of compromise and bargaining among the stakeholders.

Collaborative arrangements such as a collegium hold promise of being one of the most prominent features and outcomes of the profes-

sionalization movement. Any resistance to a collegium will perpetuate a concept which was used to define the teaching profession during the 80's -- 'a professional house divided.' Either knowingly or unknowingly, the diverse stakeholders work at cross purposes with one another. In this concept, there is no crosstalk.

How might we proceed to effect shared governance?

The key element of a collegium in order to insure our common purpose (professionalization for the benefit of the consumer), is to create an organizational structure which protects stakeholder autonomy and insures shared governance. Our social scientists tell us that we simply cannot solve twenty-first century problems with twentieth century organizational structures. Organizational structures grow old and become obsolete.

Organizational change need not be unduly complicated and slow. As one model, we need only to look at the state-level professional standards and practices boards for teaching, which is a collegium of the various state-level stakeholders. Virtually every state now has such a board.

Once an organizational structure is in place, strategic planning for fulfillment of the organizations purposes can begin. Strategic planning by a collegium of the professional community seeks answers to questions such as:

* What are the issues which transcend those which are distinct to each stakeholder?
* Should the primary function of the collegium be oversight of the various stakeholders, and/or a policy and standards body?

* How can we create a national-level collegium and yet protect the traditional notion of local and state autonomy?

* How does a multi-faceted collegium establish a base of legitimacy which transcends that of the individual stakeholders?

* To what extent can a collegium be subjected to the pressures of one or more stakeholders or altered at the will of the legislature?

* Who should be represented on the collegium, and what interests should they represent - their constituency or the larger consumer interests?

I sincerely believe that the Alliance, through its national associations, is at a crossroad of making a decision regarding whether or not to advance toward professional status. The time is right for action, especially when all around us speaks to empowerment of the profession. To fail to act, is in fact an action. Failure to act puts our professional association at variance with itself -- with its very reason for being.

If we act in favor of wanting to become a profession, I submit that we strive to attain a 'professional house united.' To this end, we must accept the notion that, at this point in time, the best (if not the only) avenue to achieve this goal. This would require each stakeholder to forego its competitive independence in favor of cooperative interdependence. To do so, we must unite in purpose and in conversation. We must crosstalk.

I further submit that the Alliance, through its national associations, be the initiator of collegiums. The crosstalk should begin with us.

CREDENTIALING RESPONSIBILITY MATRIX

Responsibilities

Audiences	Identify job tasks	Establish recognition	Formalize training	Gain political legitimation	Enforce ethics codes
Professional Organizations	*	*	*	*	*
Professional Preparation Programs	*	*	*	*	*
Employers	*	*	*	*	*
Government and Judicial Systems				*	*
Credentialing Experts			*	*	*
Credentialing Bodies			*	*	*
Practicing Professionals	*	*	*	*	*
Consumer		*		*	*